

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

Claims 15 and 23 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-29 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 23-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being allegedly indefinite.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability for claims 1-14 and 16-22.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the “computer readable medium” recited in claim 15. The Office Action alleges that “there isn’t any computer readable medium recites in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree.

A computer readable medium is apparent from the descriptive portion of the specification. For example, FIG. 1 clearly shows a memory 100 which would be understood to be a computer readable medium by the ordinarily skilled artisan. Memory 100 may be SRAM, DRAM, or “any other volatile or non-volatile memory.” (Specification: Page 6, lines 14-18). In other examples, FIGS. 5, 6, 7, and 8 shows memories. (Specification: Page 9, lines 19-20). Thus, the specification in fact discloses several examples of computer readable mediums.

The Office Action further alleges that it is not clear whether the computer readable medium is a disk storage or carrier wave. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the rejections, Applicants have amended claim 15 to recite a tangible computer readable

medium. As illustrated above, the specification discloses several examples of tangible computer readable mediums.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claim 15 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101. As discussed above, amended claim 15 recites a tangible computer readable medium, and thus is directed to an article of manufacture and recites statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 23-29 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 23 as suggest in the Office Action.

For example, amended claim 23 recites an apparatus for repairing a memory, the apparatus comprising:

self-test circuitry for testing a plurality of memory elements, the self-test circuitry including a multiplexer, fault detection circuitry, and count compare circuitry,

the multiplexer selectively coupling an output from one of the plurality of memory elements to fault detection circuitry during a self-test, and

the count compare circuitry comparing the number of fails in each of the memory elements and recording the memory element having the most fails.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23-29 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
61233266 v1